

May 3,

200,000?" It seems to me it is much more important for us to want to save all, but if we can save 1,200, that is a moral thing to do.

Mr. Castro is a diabolically clever man, as the majority leader has said, and is a very cynical man, playing loosely with the lives of human beings. He released 10 prisoners as hostages conditionally. They are not here as a part of the Cuban diplomatic service, negotiating with the U.S. diplomatic service. They are here to remind us that there are prisoners in the prison cells in Cuba that can be let out if certain things are done. It is not what we would like. Of course it is not. In fact, we have been going through some painful days on this whole Cuban situation. I have been one of the critics of the manner in which the situation was handled. But I do not believe we answer these arguments by standing up and yelling "Communist! Blackmail! Castro!" and then repeating it, "Blackmail! Castro! Communist!" That is not the answer. It seems to me the answer at this moment is to try to find a way of saving lives. I would say that even if only one life were involved, possibly we have an opportunity to do something. We may save more than 1,200 lives.

The President of the United States did not say that he was acting as a private citizen. Let us keep the record clear. I have the text of the President's statement. What he said is in the text of this statement. The President made no reference at all to his position as a private citizen. He is not a private citizen. He is the President of this great Republic. What the President of the United States said was this:

The tractors-for-freedom movement is a wholly private humanitarian movement aimed at saving the lives of several hundred men. It is supported by free men and women throughout the Americas.

\* \* \* \* \*

My concern was to help make certain that a single, representative group of citizens headed this effort in the United States. And I am grateful to Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for their leadership.

The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

Who said that the President might have been acting as a private citizen? It was a press agent at the White House, Mr. Hatcher. I quote from a United Press dispatch on the ticker:

Hatcher said Kennedy's connection with the arrangement was as a private citizen.

A pressman can speak for a President, as in this instance, but a pressman does not necessarily speak the words of the President. The President's words are in the text. At the conclusion of my remarks I will ask that the entire text of the President's statement be placed in the RECORD.

Let me say to the eternal credit of the President of the United States that he feels a moral obligation. It is a fact that this Government did train those people. We know it. The American people will

be respected all the more in the world if we act responsibly, out of a sense of humanity, in this unhappy matter. I suggest to my colleagues that during the past week we have seen pictures on the front pages of American newspapers of another freedom fighter, a young man with a battered and bloody face, the victim of brutality, vulgarity, violence, and disorder. It might not be a bad news story to go out throughout the world that the citizenry of this country was sufficiently concerned with human life to put forth private contributions and private efforts, with the endorsement and moral support of the President of the United States, in an attempt to save these men in Cuba. I do not want on my hands the fact that I failed to do what I could have done when the opportunity was given.

I did not have anything to say as a Senator or as a citizen about the action that took place when the invasion forces went to Cuba. However, I have something to say now about how we can redeem and remove from the prisons in Cuba at least some members of that invasion force and bring them back home. I do not believe that America shows itself to be cowardly by doing what is right. The world needs a little love. It would not hurt to have some in Congress too. The world has had a stomach full of hate, and it has chronic indigestion. I suggest that the world needs a little example of compassion and mercy. I do not believe it makes us look weak. The man who looks silly and weak, and the country that looks bad, are the man and country responsible for incarcerating these people, and the dictator who imprisons these people and plays loosely with them.

I do not want to be told, when we stand up like this, that we are appeasing or paying a blackmailer. I do not consider it to be blackmail at all. I consider this an opportunity to undo a wrong. This is an opportunity to save some lives. The Scriptures are filled with examples of lives being saved. So is the history book of this Nation.

I heard what was said about prisoners in China and in Russia. I wish China would say tonight that we can have our Americans back for some tractors. Are we going to go to war for that too? Is that the only answer some people have? Is the only answer they have: make war? I wish we could get some of our airmen out of Soviet Union prisons for some tractors. I am frank to tell the Senate that I would be willing to help raise the money to bring about that result.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire UPI dispatch, containing the text of the President's statement, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The tractors-for-freedom movement is a wholly private humanitarian movement aimed at saving the lives of several hundred men. It is supported by free men and women throughout the Americas.

When Fidel Castro first made his offer to exchange the lives and liberty of 1,200 prisoners for 500 agricultural tractors, the American people responded with characteristic

compassion. A number of private committees were organized to raise the necessary funds, and many private citizens, in this country and throughout the hemisphere, inquired as to where they could contribute. My concern was to help make certain that a single, representative group of citizens headed this effort in the United States. And I am grateful to Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for their leadership.

The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere. I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, inasmuch as it covers only negotiations in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States; that tax exemption is granted as a matter of course to any charitable organizations engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons, to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba, and would thus be granted for a humanitarian shipment of farm implements.

While this Government is thus putting forward neither obstacles nor assistance to this wholly private effort, I hope that all citizens will contribute what they can. If they were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help. I happen to feel deeply that all who fight for freedom—particularly in our hemisphere—are our brothers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not want on my hands the responsibility for giving Castro 500 construction tractors with which to build missile bases and airports from which to attack the United States. That is exactly what he wants those tractors for, and for no other purpose, because he has designated the model he wants. He has designated the number he wants and the manufacturer. Those designations are big tractors for the purpose of moving earth and for construction. They are not farm tractors, as some would like to have people in the United States believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What we are going to make available to Mr. Castro are farm tractors. That is the first point. Whether Mr. Castro will deal on that basis or not, I do not know.

Mr. CAPEHART. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know it because that is what the President of the United States has said.

Mr. CAPEHART. The President of the United States has said no such thing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not impressed by the silly argument that the only way Castro can get those tractors is to get them from the United States. I have the feeling that Russia also has some tractors. If the Soviet Union is willing to put MIG's in Cuba, it might be willing to put some tractors over there also with which to build military bases. Castro does not need American tractors with which to build the bases. I am sure the Senator is not trying to frighten the

Mr. MANSFIELD. He has never recognized Mr. Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. Only today the President admitted that he had called the three people whose names have been mentioned and asked them to be members of a committee to raise funds in the United States for 500 tractors to be exchanged for prisoners.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is news to me, and I do not believe it is an accurate statement of the facts.

Mr. CAPEHART. That report was on the tickertape.

Mr. MANSFIELD. His relations with the committee do not imply recognition of Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not recognition of Castro, but the President asked private citizens to form a committee to do business with Mr. Castro. How else will they get 500 tractors to Cuba to secure the release of the 1,214 prisoners if they do not do business with Mr. Castro?

I say that if we are going to deal with Castro, let us have the President of the United States deal with him, and let us deal with him in a way in which he ought to be dealt with. He, as a Communist, is trying to blackmail us, and he is out to destroy the American system of government. He would build missile bases that could kill American boys and girls.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would the Senator from Indiana do if he were in the White House? I should like to have his suggestions.

Mr. CAPEHART. First, I certainly would not agree to the tractor deal. I would pay no attention to Mr. Castro's suggestion that 500 tractors be exchanged for 1,214 prisoners. Further, if I had made this mistake and saw American people rising up against it, I would correct it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would dismiss the committee, and say to Mr. Castro, if he made the request official, that we have no interest in the proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would happen to the 1,214 prisoners?

Mr. CAPEHART. What will happen to the remaining 198,786 prisoners down there? Let us take that point into consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am talking about the 1,214 prisoners who are under consideration.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am talking about 198,786 prisoners. I am talking about the Americans, who are in prison in Red China and the one who is in prison in Russia. I am talking about all of them, and I am thinking in terms of future generations. Any dictator could steal from the United States and arrest some U.S. citizens and say to the United States, "You give us so many tractors, or so much of this or that, and we will release them." I am thinking of future generations. The Congress had better start talking and thinking about future generations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 99 other Senators in this body likewise are thinking about future generations as well as the present generation. There are 99 other Senators who are equally troubled as is the Senator from Indiana

concerning events which are happening throughout the world.

But again I return to my basic question. If the Senator from Indiana happened to occupy the White House and this situation arose, what would he do? What is the alternative which the President faces?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me answer that question.

First, when Mr. Castro expropriated \$150 million of American property, including the Nicaro nickel mine in Cuba, I would have sent the U.S. forces to recover it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What else would the Senator from Indiana do?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me read this statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask the Senator to answer the question and then he can read the statement. First, he would send in the Army. Then I suppose he would send in the Marine Corps, then the Navy, and the Air Force. What would be the next step?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would do whatever is necessary. If it meant sending in the Marines, the Navy, or the Army, I would do whatever would be necessary to keep Russia from establishing a satellite nation in Cuba and building air bases, missile bases, and submarine bases. I would do whatever was necessary, even if it means going to war, because if we do not do so, sooner or later we may be at war. That is exactly what I would do, and I state it in straight language.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is, if anything, frank. He said very forthrightly that on the basis of expropriation, which would include private holdings as well as the Government-operated Nicaro Nickel mine, he would favor armed intervention. Is that the answer to the situation confronted by the free world in Cuba?

Mr. CAPEHART. What other answer is there? Are we for communism or are we against it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know of no Senator who is in favor of communism, but that is quite beside the point. There have been resolutions passed in this body time after time, which express unanimously the feeling of the Senate toward communism. I trust there is no doubt about that in anyone's mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. I read a statement from the tickertape:

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy today asked public contributions to the tractors-for-prisoners exchange with Fidel Castro, and disclosed he helped organize the private citizens committee which is raising funds for the deal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is wrong with that action?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The President of the United States should be handling this situation—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has yielded to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have a question of the Senator from Montana. At the present time the Eichmann trial is in progress in Israel. A great deal of debate has taken place in that trial concerning whether at one period during World War II Eichmann would have saved the lives of many Jews if he could have traded them for trucks. There is a dispute about whether he could have traded the trucks or whether the Allied Nations would trade the trucks.

My question to the distinguished majority leader is this: Is it not the moral judgment of the world today that if the opportunity were offered to trade trucks for the lives of Jews who were being exterminated by a dictator, even during a shooting war, the lives of such Jews should have been saved by the trading of the trucks? Is that not the moral judgment of the civilized world today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe such would be the consensus, and I believe there is a parallel between the case of Eichmann and the Jews, and the case of Castro and the Cuban prisoners of war.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask the distinguished majority leader this further question: If we were to stand by while these 1,214 men, who were armed by the United States, were stood up against a wall and shot, does the majority leader not think that the moral judgment of the world would be against us for permitting such shooting if we could have prevented it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the difficult situation in which we find ourselves, I believe that if something untoward should develop in the situation, we should have something on our consciences to live with.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask the distinguished majority leader whether he thinks the moral judgment of the world will place the blood and lives of these 1,214 men in importance above an internal domestic tax regulation of the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have asked the distinguished majority leader to yield for two purposes: First, I wish to commend him for a splendid, logical, reasonable, sensible, and compassionate statement.

Second, I wish to say to Senators who are asking who will defend the President's actions or will speak up for the President, that other Senators will do so, and I am one of those Senators.

Mr. President, it is quite obvious that it would be the desire of the American people to save the lives of all prisoners under all dictators. This is one of the purposes of our foreign policy—at least one of them—as well as to liberate these prisoners in the world who have been enslaved by dictators. That is one of the principal objectives of this Nation. I do not believe it is a cogent or convincing argument to say, "If we can save 1,200, what about the other

Mr. MANSFIELD. When we speak of some 1,240 prisoners, and what our interest is, I assume our interest is in the fact that they were a part of an invasion force, trained either in this country or somewhere close to it, and thereby a certain obligation has been created, which in effect sets them apart.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It sets them apart from the 200,000 or 300,000 prisoners.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. We had the word of the President of the United States, in a press conference a couple of weeks before this happened, that the United States was taking no part in the invasion, directly or indirectly, and that we had nothing to do with it. That is the impression he left with me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. Did he or did he not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. He affirmed that we would not intervene.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator will understand I am not speaking politically. I think it has been admitted that under the previous administration training camps were set up for the purpose of training these individuals.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the purpose of training them to invade Cuba.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. I do not know why the President of the United States would deny it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know that he did deny it. All I can go on is the newspaper reports to this effect. I think the story I mentioned was given out at Gettysburg a few months ago.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. In response to the suggestion that, after all, these 1,240 prisoners are in a separate status because they are in Cuba as the result of the invasion, we can think back to the events of the week before the invasion, when the President declared that America would not intervene, that America would not be guilty of aggression. Then came the actual invasion. Following the invasion was the official declaration by the President that he assumed full responsibility.

The question was asked a little while ago, "What would you do if you were in the President's position?"

I should like to pose a question. The men who are involved are 1,240 criminals, by Cuban law. These men are criminals because they shot at Cuban troops. They are criminals because they violated the laws of Cuba. They are in jail for that. The proposal is made, "Give us tractors and we will release these men."

If it be said that those men are in a special category because they are in Cuba by reason of the invasion, and that the President of the United States took full personal and official responsibility for the occasion, then I say in order to be

consistent the President should take official responsibility for it. To say at this late hour, "It is a personal, private citizen who is now talking, who wants to buy tractors to trade for 1,240 people who are there," it seems to me shows at least a lack of consistency.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator from Nebraska has, in effect, brushed off 1,242 or 1,243 Cubans who are prisoners because of the invasion. I do not think we should treat them in that fashion. I think we have an interest in their welfare.

I think what the civilian group is attempting to do is based on humanitarian interests and desires. If we forget these 1,242 prisoners we say, in effect, to the 10 who came to plead for them—we say to the 1,242 and to the 10—"To the wall."

I hope Senators will believe me when I say that hundreds in Cuba have already gone to the wall since Mr. Castro came into power 2 years and 5 or 6 months ago.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska has not said, "To the wall" to these 1,240 men.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has referred to them as criminals.

Mr. HRUSKA. They are criminals in the eyes of the Cubans. The only thing which sets them apart and makes them of interest to us is the acknowledgment by the President of the United States that he takes full responsibility for their being in Cuba. In effect, that is what is meant.

I would not say "To the wall" to them, but I say that if there is any intervention on the part of the President it should not be as a private citizen and as a personal matter, after he has taken action as an official of the United States, as its Chief Executive, in order to get them in the predicament in which they now find themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator advocate recognition of Cuba again?

Mr. HRUSKA. Not at all. There are other matters with respect to which we approach Cuba. How is it done. It is done through the regularly designated alternate diplomatic source.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Through the Swiss.

Mr. HRUSKA. Those channels are resorted to. Why can they not be resorted to for this purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. Surely.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was asking the majority leader to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to reply to the Senator first.

I suppose we could carry on activities from this end through the Swiss Embassy or the Swiss Minister, as we have done in the case of other matters, in getting Americans out of Cuba.

I suppose we could work through the Organization of American States, as suggested by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I think there may

be merit to the suggestions, although each presents certain difficulties.

It may well be that instead of a private group of citizens engaging in accumulating tractors of various kinds to exchange for prisoners it would be better if some organization or some system were established whereby negotiations could be carried on to bring about the release of these men through the Organization of American States. I cannot judge, on the basis of a floor debate, the merits of such a suggestion.

All I can say is that the President of the United States has been placed by events in a very embarrassing, delicate, and dangerous position.

So far as I am concerned—and I would say this about a Republican President, as I have on other occasions—the President of the United States will have my full support, because he is confronted not alone with difficulties in Cuba but with difficulties all over the world. What we ought to do is to develop a sense of understanding and tolerance for this man with whom we served, for this man whom we know, for this man who was elected by the American people to lead all of us for the next 4 years.

We can find fault with any man with whom we wish to find fault. Even Senators are not perfect.

I ask my colleagues to display a little tolerance and a little understanding. Instead of criticizing the President day in and day out, give him the support which he so badly needs at this time. I hope Senators will believe me when I say that if they do so they will be doing their country more good than by criticizing the President day in and day out.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope I never to live to see the day when I shall fail as a U.S. Senator, elected by the people of my State, to criticize a President, whether he be of my party or of the opposite party, if I think he is wrong.

I do not think we could maintain a representative form of government—a democracy in America—if U.S. Senators were denied the right to criticize the President of the United States. If such were the case, we would have a dictatorship.

I know some people would like to have us refrain from criticism. I have not in the past hesitated to criticize a Republican President, and I do not today hesitate to criticize a Democratic President. I have made the statement several times tonight that the President of the United States is a human being. He will make mistakes. Those around him will make mistakes. I think what he is doing is a terrible mistake. I would like to give him an opportunity to correct that mistake.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How?

Mr. CAPEHART. Very simple. In the first place, he should never have recognized Mr. Castro when he spoke about 500 tractors being exchanged for prisoners.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President has never recognized Mr. Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. What?

other quarter earlier today, that, in my judgment, the sooner we get the problem involving the prisoners, as well as other problems involving Cuba, into the forum of the Organization of American States, the better.

It is of the utmost important that we recognize before the world that it is not appropriate for us alone to determine the solution of the Communist problem, which has been created by Fidel Castro in the Western Hemisphere. So far as I am concerned, from the standpoint of our national policy, I suggest that what we ought to be urging is that our friends in the Organization of American States convene in an extraordinary session of that organization at once, and that we say we are perfectly willing to lay this whole question before the Organization of American States for solution.

I would be perfectly willing to have this official committee appointed as our representatives to the Organization of American States. In what? Oh, it is an ugly term in the minds of many. In negotiations, through the Organization of American States, with Cuba. In my judgment, we can hope for no possible success in the honor of our country, or to the credit of our country, or to peace, by trying to carry on negotiations with Castro through a volunteer committee, now made official.

We do not have diplomatic relations with Cuba. I do not think they should have been broken. I said that the other night. We cannot follow a course of action, no matter if it is clothed in the words of humanitarianism, by way of subterfuge, in connection with attempted negotiation or back-door negotiations with Castro.

It must be done now through the procedures of a charter on which is found the signature of the United States, the signature of Cuba, and the signatures of 19 other members of the Organization of American States.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, my suggestion, for whatever it is worth, is that we bring this problem before the forum of the Organization of American States, to see what that forum can do in regard to the negotiations for the settlement of the prisoner problem, and many other problems. The prisoner problem is only one of the problems that may arise to plague the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

I stand, with the majority leader, shoulder to shoulder with the President. That does not mean I entirely approve of the course of action which has been taken in respect to this problem. I happen to believe that in the beginning the President was given bad advice. I think he had better take a look at the adviser. But that stage is behind us now. The welfare of the country calls on us to rally behind our President and to see what we can do, through the Organization of American States, to devise a program which will make it possible for all the American nations to join in dealing with Castro. The President has indicated that we are willing to enter into negotiations in regard to this subject.

I have stated my position. I shall await, with great interest, and with prayers on my lips, the means of arriving at a peaceful way to handle this problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to review, in an unemotional way, a few facts. First, is there anyone who believes that Khrushchev and communism and Castro are not out to destroy the American system of government, to destroy America, and, if necessary, go to war? Is there anyone who feels any more sorry for these Cubans who are in prison—the 1,214 of them—than they do for the American boys who tonight are in prison in Red China, or the one American boy who is imprisoned in Russia, and other Americans who have been imprisoned?

Is there anyone here naive enough to believe that he wants these tractors—he specified model and make—for any other purpose than, in the first place, to embarrass the United States before the world, by resorting to blackmailing the United States, and, in the second place, to build missile and other types of military bases?

Is there anyone here so naive to believe for a moment that Castro is not taking his orders from Moscow?

Is there any Senator so naive as to believe Mr. Castro means any good by these proposals?

Are we against communism or are we for it?

We are members of the Organization of American States. We have been saying that we cannot do certain things in Cuba, that we cannot stop Mr. Castro, because we are members of the Organization of American States. We say that the OAS will object, and that we have got to get their permission. Why did we not invite them in on this project?

Is there anyone here naive enough to believe that the President did not suggest that the committee do this? The President admitted it in a press release. Is there anyone here naive enough to believe the President did not say the contributions would be tax exempt, and that he would give an export license to ship these tractors to Cuba, when we have at the moment a prohibition against shipping to Cuba anything which could be used for war purposes?

Is there anyone who will deny those facts?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me finish.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought the Senator had asked a question, because I wanted to answer some of the allegations he has made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am taking no longer than the Senator from Oregon took for his remarks.

Mr. Khrushchev has told us our children will live under communism. Mr. Castro has told the world that he is a Communist and that his nation is communistic. He has expropriated billions of dollars worth of American property.

He took over a \$150 million nickel mine in Cuba owned by the American Government.

There are those who say we have got to exchange 500 heavy duty tractors for 1,214 prisoners—not American prisoners, but Cuban prisoners.

If I were the President and I were making the deal, I would say, "All right. We will give you the 500 tractors if you will release the 200,000 prisoners you have." But why pick out 1,200? Castro will reply, "I have 1,200 more Cuban nationals who took part in the attempted revolution. He has told us that after the attempted revolution he put 200,000 persons in jail. What is the difference between the 200,000 he put in jail at that time and the 1,214 we are talking about?"

I said a moment ago I think the President and this committee are making a mistake. I said they are human beings and they are entitled to make mistakes. The only reason why I have been standing on the floor tonight and the last few days is that I think it is a terrible mistake. I think a precedent is being set that in the years and months to come will tempt every little dictator and nation to blackmail the United States.

There comes a time in every man's life, as there does in a nation's life, when a man must stand up for his honor. I think honor is at stake. I think this transaction is 100 percent blackmail. I think we are violating the law by doing what we are attempting.

I would be more amenable toward what we are doing if the executive branch would say that we have an obligation to these 1,240 or more people, and if the executive branch would deal directly with the Government of Cuba. But, rather, the President says, "I am a private individual. I make this recommendation, not as the President of the United States, but as a private individual."

Who in the world is so naive as to believe that we can handle this problem with Castro except as one government to another?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have the greatest respect for the able Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will answer that question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not question the Senator's motives. I merely want the Senator to deal in this instance with facts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. May I ask the Senator if it is not true that diplomatic relations with the Cuban Government have been broken?

There is no diplomatic relationship between the two governments at the present time. The Swiss are serving as agents for diplomatic relationships between the two governments.

So far as Mr. Castro himself is concerned, I have yet to hear a good word spoken in his behalf on the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 100 percent with the able Senator from Montana.

May 24

humanitarian motives which led them to act as they have.

Castro is willing to trade men for machines. Distinguished Americans have invited other Americans to join with them in trading machines for men. They value life. Castro obviously values machines above life. The committee of Americans wishes to save the lives of these courageous men. They want to prevent the bloody tribunals which have been used by the Castro regime as a substitute for justice.

I hope Senators will never forget the more than 600 Cubans who were executed by being sent to the wall in the early days after the farcical trials of the present regime of Mr. Castro.

The fact that these Americans are willing to raise money to buy tractors in exchange for redeeming the lives of men who otherwise would be exposed to the cruel and primitive treatment of the Cuban Government does not reflect on them; it reflects on Fidel Castro and the Cuban Government, who are willing to trade human beings as commodities in international commerce.

Questions have also been raised about the relationship of the U.S. Government to the action of this committee. The President has made it clear that the Government should not be involved and is not involved in the action of the committee. This is surely a wise position. At the same time, it would not be desirable for the Government to seek to prevent the private action which is within the rights of those taking the action. It has been suggested that members of the committee should have consulted with the Department of State in the course of organizing the committee. This is entirely reasonable, and it is to be hoped that such consultations were held. It has also been suggested, however, that unless the Department of State approved, the committee should not have been organized. This concept, if carried to its logical conclusion, would prevent private activities of any sort which might not be approved by the Government, and sanction only those private activities which had the stamp of Government approval. This would be a highly unfortunate and undesirable condition.

One of the hazards as well as one of the blessings of democracy is the freedom of individuals and groups to engage in activities relating to our foreign relations, so long as they are within the legitimate limits set by law. Since in this case there does not seem to be any conflict with the law, it is not reasonable or correct to suggest that the committee should have been approved by the Department of State before it was organized. The very nature of its mission would have made this not only unlikely but undesirable. It may be that the Department of State has certain reservations about the exchange, but it would not be wise for the Government to seek to prevent a legitimate private activity, even if it does not wholly approve of such activities.

#### BROADER IMPLICATIONS OF THE CASTRO PROPOSAL AND OF OUR RELATIONS WITH CUBA

First. It should be made clear that the United States welcomes genuine prog-

ress in Cuba for the benefit of the people of Cuba, not just economic progress, but also social and political progress, as well. Tractors are needed to aid in the economic development of Cuba; and if the regime of Fidel Castro had not forfeited its good will in the United States, it would very likely be receiving economic aid of this nature today. But under the totalitarian system which has been instituted in Cuba, tractors will never bring to the people of Cuba the conditions of life which they need and deserve. So long as they are deprived of even the most basic right in a democratic society—the right to vote—economic development will not bring the better life which the revolution had promised to produce.

As was recently said by one of the great democratic liberals of Latin America, Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre, of Peru:

We cannot confuse that which was idealistic, authentic, and just in the beginning of the Cuban revolution with the surrender, submission, and homage to something which is anti-American and totalitarian and which is opposed to the traditional sense of our ideal of bread with freedom.

Second. The Cuban revolution has devoured many of its children. The list of those who have been executed or exiled continues to grow. In its defiance of the principles it once espoused, and of the great declarations of Santiago, San Jose, and the Treaty of Rio, as well as the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Cuban Government has turned a hope into a threat to the whole hemisphere.

Third. The United States continues to support the fundamental human rights and basic human needs of the Cuban people, and their legitimate aspirations for a better life. It shall continue to work toward an improvement in the situation in Cuba, with respect to these matters, despite the attempts by the Castro government to turn the Cuban people against those who have traditionally been their friends. Despite the provocation and denial of human rights represented by the proposed exchange, the U.S. Government and the people of the United States will remain ready to renew their association with the people of Cuba on the basis of respect for human rights and for common principles of international law.

If my colleagues have not already done so, I hope they will look at the picture of the 10 Cuban hostages who now are in this country, speaking in behalf of approximately 1,240 of their comrades who are incarcerated in Cuban prisons. I ask my colleagues to examine their hearts and their consciences. I ask them to place themselves in the position of the President of the United States; and then, after they do so, to ask themselves this one question: "What would I do if the responsibility were mine, and what is the alternative?"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the majority leader that I am more proud of him now than ever before—and I have

always been very proud of him. I congratulate him for the very moving and courageous speech he has just made in the Senate. He has raised some issues which we must face in the days immediately ahead.

As to the question of supporting the President, the President has now made the official statement of policy, and the President must be supported in carrying out his policy. This does not mean that the policy is not subject to further change. But the situation tonight is quite different from the situation this time last night, because some of us were trying to learn, had a right to try to learn, what the official policy of the White House was. Today the White House and the State Department have made clear that the so-called Reuther-Roosevelt-Eisenhower committee was an official committee from the beginning, in the sense that from the very beginning it was acting with the full knowledge and approval of the administration. In his usual forthright, honest, and courageous way, the President has made that clear to the American people. That makes quite a difference to me, as compared to the situation which we understood to exist as of yesterday; namely, that a volunteer committee had proceeded to follow a course of action which was bound to involve the foreign policy of our country. There is no way to escape that.

Although honest men may differ, in my judgment, no committee—neither this committee nor any other committee—has a right to proceed to form itself into a foreign relations body that involves the rights and interests of the 180 million American people in respect to the relationship of this Republic to the rest of the world. That is why I was heard to say before—and I continue to stand on that statement—that, in my judgment, we must not permit voluntary committees to follow that course of action.

There is no question about the humanitarian aspects of the situation; there is no question about the high motives of the President of the United States. There is no question that the President, in taking the position he is taking, has shown to the world, as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, the kind of cynic and irresponsible person in world affairs Fidel Castro is.

Now that the situation has been made much clearer by the President—and I assume that it will be made even clearer tomorrow, when he speaks to the Congress and to the entire Nation—another question also to be considered is what we need to do from now on.

I do not think this problem could possibly be limited to an issue between the United States and Cuba. Regardless of whether we act now through an official volunteer committee whose humanitarian purposes have White House approval or whether we proceed through any other medium, the Cuban problem is no longer a United States problem. That has been true from the beginning. Instead, it is a problem of the Western Hemisphere.

It is a problem of the Western Hemisphere. I want to say, as I said in an-

1961

mitted today that he has formed this three-person committee to develop foreign policy.

Is there any reason why we should not form a Capehart-Goldwater-Mundt committee to go to China to exchange solid gold Cadillacs for people the Chinese are holding, or go to Laos to free some Lao? To me this is a very serious and dangerous day in our history. I believe that our children and grandchildren will rue the day that the Senate of the United States allowed this to happen without challenging the President of the United States for usurping constitutional powers.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator. I have said repeatedly on the floor of the Senate and to the press that I believe the President is violating the Logan Act in this particular instance.

If any Senator can condone what is happening, I wish he would rise and do so. If any Senator will condone what is happening, I wish he would do so.

The President of the United States is subject to human error. He will make mistakes. He cannot help making mistakes. No man can handle the responsibilities of the President of the United States without making mistakes. In this instance he has made a mistake. It seems to me the best thing he can do, for the American people and the world, and as a leader of the free world, is to admit that he has made a mistake, and view Mr. Castro in his just regards.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana and other Senators. At least a dozen times the Senator from Indiana has asked for someone to stand up and, in effect, be counted. He has asked for people outside the Chamber to do the same thing. I am willing to stand up and be counted on the side of the President of the United States. The President of the United States is charged under the Constitution with the conduct of our foreign policy.

It is true that a group of private American citizens has endeavored to show up Fidel Castro's cynicism. That is exactly what it is. The group has shown him up with great effect throughout Latin America. If my memory serves me correctly, even in the great Republic of Brazil a newspaper has seen fit to offer one tractor in exchange for 4 prisoners. I believe that this group of private citizens is attempting to do something which will save the Freedom Fighters who were captured by Castro in the ill-fated invasion of Cuba. The U.S. Government, rightly or wrongly, did not prevent those men from invading their homeland in an attempt to regain its freedom.

The only question facing the Government now is: Should we prevent a private group in their humanitarian efforts to free these prisoners? Are we to place tractors above men? Are we to place cynicism above humanity? Are we to criticize rather than show a little kindness, a little understanding, a little brotherliness toward people who were attempting to do what they thought was

right with aid from the United States? The U.S. Government is not paying ransom or tribute or blackmail.

Why should the Government place any obstacles in the way of the private committee which is seeking to do something of a humanitarian nature, seeking to perform a good which will benefit the United States in the eyes of mankind the world over? Who are we to criticize the private citizens who are seeking to raise money for the purpose of doing good by returning the Cuban prisoners to their freedom and their families? What will happen if they fail? What will happen to the 10 Cuban prisoners whom Mr. Castro sent to Florida, and who have 1 week in which to reach an agreement, at the end of which time they must return to Cuba? What will they return to? What will be the fate of the 1,240 Cuban prisoners whom they represent?

I wish we would think this problem through. I wish we would not become so emotional as to forget the facts of life as they are, but would recognize that this is an extremely difficult, delicate, and dangerous situation. Instead of criticizing the President of the United States, we should be upholding his hand, because he is not the President of a political party; he is the President of all the people of the country, and his burdens are terrible. Why should we tear this man down? We served with him in this Chamber for 8 years. We know the kind of man he is. We know the troubles which beset him. We know he is doing his very best to face up to them and to try to bring about a solution, not only in the interest of the people of the United States, but in the interest of the people of the entire world.

I have heard hardly a word in this Chamber in behalf of the President of the United States, a man who has been in office less than 5 months, and who already is beginning to feel the barbs and the arrows of partisan attack. We ought to be big enough to understand what confronts him. Instead of criticizing him, we ought to give him our full and wholehearted support.

Oh, yes; questions have been raised about the Logan Act. Questions have been raised about export licenses. Questions have been raised about tax exemption. Concerning tax exemption, which seems to be a favorite topic, tax exemptions are always granted to any charitable organization engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees or in other humanitarian work. Why should anyone seek to make an exception in this case? The lives of men are at stake, and what may well be at stake is the future of the United States in this hemisphere. I do not underestimate Mr. Castro. He is one of the shrewdest, most ruthless men in the world today. Do not take my word for it. Go back to the record. Since he came into power on January 1, 1959, the record will show just how smart, how shrewd, how ruthless, how deadly he is.

Every American and every other free man is interested in the fate of those who are now held as prisoners by the

Government of Cuba. Besides being entitled to elemental human rights and to fair and just treatment legally, they are also certainly entitled to due consideration as Cubans by the present Government of Cuba. It is important to understand that in the strict sense they are not prisoners of war; they are prisoners of a civil war in which they risked their lives to bring a greater measure of freedom and democracy to their country and, by the same token, had they succeeded, to our other neighbors in this hemisphere.

If the Government of Cuba is afraid to give those prisoners their freedom; if it is so unsure about the loyalty of the Cuban people that it is fearful of releasing the prisoners and letting them choose whether they should remain in Cuba or continue to live in exile, this is even further proof that the Government of Cuba is not a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Nothing, in fact, better indicates the betrayal of the high ideals of the Cuban revolution than the callous treatment of human life and human values represented by the proposal of Premier Castro to exchange prisoners—men—for machines. Nothing demonstrates better the inhuman, undemocratic nature of the Castro regime than the offer to trade fellow Cubans for tractors.

It behooves Premier Castro to recall that his own life was spared early in his career because he was afforded the protection of basic human rights, but he now seems to have forgotten that making such a proposal. How far he has departed from his own promise of a new life for the Cuban people, which would not only provide public order, peace, freedom, and protection of individual rights, but also result in the fulfillment of international commitments.

In proposing to trade men for machines, he has offered further evidence not only of his betrayal of the ideals of the Cuban revolution, but of his unwillingness even to abide by the most common rules of civilized intercourse. It has been stated that the response by a committee of leading American citizens to the exchange offer constitutes behavior which is unworthy of Americans. It has been said that they are being blackmailed into making the exchange, and it has been said, indirectly, that the Government of the United States has been blackmailed into making the exchange. It has even been suggested that the members of the committee are not within their rights in agreeing to the exchange. Whatever one may think of the wisdom of responding to the exchange offer in this fashion, it would certainly appear to be within the rights of private citizens to organize such a committee and to arrange with the prisoners themselves for the exchange.

Rather than constituting blackmail, Castro's action can be considered a form of extortion which reflects the callous inhumanity of the Castro regime. Whether American citizens are wise in taking this course is not for me to pretend to judge, but I am certain of the

May 24

know where they are; and this great Government does nothing about getting them back.

Mr. CAPEHART. So far we have talked only about 1,214 prisoners, while we know that Castro has in prisons in Cuba men who were just as much freedom fighters as the 1,214. To take Castro at his own word, they number 200,000.

About 10 days before the so-called invasion the President of the United States made a statement that we would have nothing to do with the invasion.

If we had nothing to do with the invasion, then why are we so concerned at the moment? Mr. Castro has told us that he wants the 500 tractors as indemnity for the damage that the United States did during the invasion. That is Castro's point of view. There is no question that in Castro's mind but what he is representing the communist government of Cuba. Yet today the President of the United States, if I understand the releases properly, has said—and if I misunderstood his statement I will be happy to correct the RECORD—that he is acting as a private individual. He said that he did ask the committee members to form the committee, and that their endeavor would be tax exempt. It is reported in the newspapers that he would see that an export license is issued.

On the other hand, we have a prohibition against shipping to Castro any materials other than some foodstuffs and medical supplies.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has emphasized several times that the President stated in a press release, which has been read on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Indiana, that the President said he was acting as a private individual. Can the Senator from Indiana tell the Senator from South Dakota whether or not it was the President's position that he was acting as a private individual when he formed a committee to secure contributions to this fund, that the money collected would be tax exempt and, if so, how a private individual could make such a wholesale promise?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot read the President's mind in that respect. There is no way in the world that a President can act as a private individual, particularly concerning problems that have to do with two nations, because the Constitution states that the President of the United States has complete charge of foreign affairs.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the Senator ever heard of an individual citizen of the United States granting an export license on material that can be used for purposes of making war against the United States?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I never have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks an article published in the Baltimore Sun, issue of

Wednesday morning, May 24, 1961, reporting the statement of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**TRACTOR IDEA IS DEFENDED: BUT DR. EISENHOWER LIKENS SWAP TO KIDNAP RANSOM**

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, cochairman of a drive to raise \$15 million for tractors to be used for repatriation of more than 1,200 Cuban rebels, yesterday likened the exchange to that of a mother paying ransom to regain her kidnaped child.

The brother of the former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, told a press conference here he was saddened and surprised at criticism of the venture expressed by members of his own party. Dr. Eisenhower is a Republican.

A drive to raise money for the tractors and bulldozers stems from a bid by Cuban Premier Fidel Castro to exchange 1,214 prisoners which he captured during the recent Cuban invasion for 500 heavy-duty tractors costing about \$34,000 apiece.

**CITES CENTRAL PROBLEM**

Eisenhower expressed the hope that the criticism will not impede the committee's efforts.

"By whatever name you call it," he said, "the central problem is 1,214 decent people."

The Johns Hopkins University president said the committee sent telegrams to 50 leaders of industry, labor and cultural life throughout the country asking their participation. He said he had not yet had a chance to talk to former President Eisenhower about contributing to the campaign.

Although he said he appreciated the flood of telegrams, phone calls, and contributions which had been sent him, he requested all contributors to send their money to "Tractors for Freedom," Detroit, Mich. He said all such contributions would be tax exempt and that the fundraising was sanctioned by the Government.

Enumerating his reasons for joining the group, the Hopkins president said he had done so for three reasons:

1. It is a bipartisan effort.
2. No matter how angry one may be about some elements going on there (Cuba), 1,214 human beings are involved and I don't see how Americans can refuse a call for help.

3. I am absolutely certain that the response in Latin America to any such exchange will be good.

Mr. CAPEHART. Furthermore, I wish to say for the RECORD that there is no question that Milton Eisenhower is a Republican. Hence, I am not playing partisan politics with this subject. I am 100 percent opposed to this proposal. It is morally wrong. I shall fight it as long as I have breath left in me. What we are going will be a precedent that will haunt us for many years to come. Dr. Eisenhower compared this transaction with a mother whose child had been kidnapped. Those 1,214 men knew what they were going. They were fighting for their own country. They are Cubans, not Americans. We are talking about a dictator, a Communist, who has told us that his nation is a Communist nation and that he will destroy us.

He has said, "I will release these people if you will give us 500 tractors." He was not referring to farm tractors, but the kind of tractors that can be used to build missile bases and to build roads and do construction work.

Unless we are all wrong about communism—and I have heard about it on

the floor of the Senate for 17 years—they are out to destroy us. They are out to kill us. They did us irreparable harm in the Korean war. Yet we are saying to Castro, "We are going to help you."

I want no part of it. I hope the American people will rise up and put a stop to it. I feel sorry for those who have advised the President of the United States on this matter and I am apprehensive about what he is doing.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is a distinguished businessman and a substantial taxpayer. Perhaps he can help me write an answer to a letter I received from a South Dakota farmer today, dealing with this subject. He writes that he noticed that the President had said—or perhaps it was the Internal Revenue Service—that a ruling had been made that contributions to this committee would be tax exempt, and that the President, acting as a private citizen, said that he had waived the taxes on this project, and my constituent would like to know how a private individual can waive a magic wand and decide that the taxes in this case would be waived because the tractors are to be sent to Cuba.

Therefore my farmer friend wants to know whether the President could wave both wands and make a tractor that the farmer has to buy tax exempt also, so that he can use that tractor on his farm in South Dakota.

Mr. CAPEHART. There would be more reason for granting a tax exemption in the case referred to by the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, how can we make a tractor that is shipped to a Communist country tax exempt if a farmer in South Dakota who buys a tractor to use on his farm must pay taxes on the money he uses to buy a tractor for use on his farm? Can the Senator give me any solace that I can pass on to the farmer in South Dakota?

Mr. CAPEHART. No, I cannot help the Senator on that question. I do not know.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps if we were sending cash to Castro, the Internal Revenue Service might consider the cash as being tax exempt. So far as the tractors are concerned, I cannot see any reason why we should discriminate against an American farmer in behalf of Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. The whole thing to me is ridiculous.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe terms like "silly" and "ridiculous" should not be used in a case like this. It is much too serious. The Senate should very seriously consider the subject. Historically we have formed foreign policy by the Executive working with the advice and consent of the Senate. Yet here we are forming foreign policy by a personal committee appointed by the President. He tells us about it now. I do not know that he has ever denied it. Perhaps he was never asked about it. He has ad-

1961

8191

ness with the enemy would likely be shot or imprisoned as a traitor. We are at war with Castro's Cuba.

I repeat that statement:

In any war a civilian who did business with the enemy would likely be shot or imprisoned as a traitor. We are at war with Castro's Cuba.

We paid for a silly invasion in which a lot of people were killed, and now we want to buy back bodies with some lousy tractors out of private purses so that what currently passes for a State Department can turn its head from the deal and disclaim involvement.

We have been blackmailed in various ways for so long that they do not bother to blackmail us in terms of countries and billions of dollars anymore. We have now degenerated to peanuts-and-pennies in our deals. I suppose, in future, if Castro sends us a few heads or hands, as the Arabs used to, we will work up a thriving trade in second-hand cars and old TV sets in return for somebody's sisters.

I hold in my hand the Baltimore Sun for Wednesday morning, May 24, 1961, handed to me by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

The headline on the article is "Tractor Idea Is Defended, But Dr. Eisenhower Likens Swap to Kidnap Ransom."

The article states:

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, cochairman of a drive to raise \$15 million for tractors to be used for repatriation of more than 1,200 Cuban rebels, yesterday likened the exchange to that of a mother paying ransom to regain her kidnaped child.

I ask Senators to think of that. He likened the exchange to that of a mother paying ransom to regain her kidnaped child.

The brother of the former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, told a press conference here he was saddened and surprised at criticism of the venture expressed by members of his own party. Dr. Eisenhower is a Republican.

A drive to raise money for the tractors and bulldozers stems from a bid by Cuban Premier Fidel Castro to exchange 1,214 prisoners which he captured during the recent Cuban invasion for 500 heavy-duty tractors costing about \$34,000 apiece.

#### CITES CENTRAL PROBLEM

Eisenhower expressed the hope that the criticism will not impede the committee's efforts.

"By whatever name you call it," he said, "the central problem is 1,214 decent people."

Dictator Castro has already told us that as a result of the so-called invasion he had imprisoned, not 1,214, but 200,000 Cubans. If we are going to be blackmailed into trading 500 heavy-duty tractors for 1,214 so-called prisoners, why do we not say to Castro, "Release the entire 200,000." Why do we pick out the 1,214?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Has anyone ever told us how many real American citizens Castro has in jail?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think anyone has, but I assume he has a number.

Mr. BENNETT. As illustrated in the story of a mother ransoming her daughter, should we not be more concerned with getting Americans out of Castro's

jails than in getting Cubans out of Castro's jails?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think so, but nothing has been done about that situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. It has been reported that a tax deduction will be given for contributions to this scheme. Can the distinguished Senator from Indiana tell the Senate who made that statement?

Mr. CAPEHART. That a tax deduction would be given?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. According to the ticker tape, I understand the President of the United States made that statement today.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the President of the United States contend that such is the law now, or is it his contention that by Presidential edict and announcement he can term what is taxable and what is not?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think such is the law. I cannot answer the Senator's second question. It would amaze me to learn that through blackmail a payment of \$40 million on tractors for a Communist country would be tax deductible. When did communism become a charitable institution?

Mr. CURTIS. Has anything been published concerning the negotiations to the effect that Americans will be released?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer that question. I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. There has been nothing published?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know. I know that Castro has bragged about the fact that he imprisoned 200,000 people when the so-called invasion took place.

Mr. CURTIS. How many has Castro shot without trial?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer that question. But he has bragged about the fact that he has shot many. I wish I could tell the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can the Senator understand the President when he said that the U.S. Government is not a party to the negotiations, in view of the fact that the President himself set up the three-person committee and then asked that tax exemption be given to the proposed blackmail?

Mr. CAPEHART. I can only answer that question by saying, "How naive does the President think the people of the United States and the world are?" The President has acted. He stated that he was going to see that an export license would be issued. Yet he has stated that he is acting as a private individual.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The President of the United States cannot act as a private individual except in his own church.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course he cannot.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Any more than the Senator from Indiana or I could any longer act as private individuals after we were elected U.S. Senators.

May I call to the attention of the Senator from Indiana article II, section 2, paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the United States concerning the powers of the President:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

I suggest to my friend from Indiana that if this arrangement is a treaty, it is a blackmail treaty. The President has not asked the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States and, so far as I know, he has not conferred with anyone except Arthur Schlesinger.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure he has conferred with him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. He would have to.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator. Here is a deal between the United States Government and the Cuban Government, headed by Castro, an admitted Communist. Yet the President of the United States said that in recommending that the committee raise the required \$20 million or \$40 million, whatever the amount is, for 500 tractors, he is dealing as a private individual.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that the President cannot act as a private citizen. When he speaks, he speaks as the President of the United States. When he spoke today, he committed our Government, our Republic, to subject itself on its humble knees to the blackmail of this bearded giant Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the President likewise said that contributions would be tax deductible, and that he would like to have an export license to ship the tractors to Cuba. They are not farm tractors; they are commercial tractors, the kind used to move dirt and perform construction work.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not wish to detain the Senator, but in his remarks today the President said:

If they were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help.

I might suggest to our President that we have some prisoners in totalitarian prison camps, and they have been there for a long time. I have not seen anything done with respect to them. I do not remember the details—I am looking them up—but I can recall that on the floor of the Senate a number of years ago a Senator attempted the same kind of negotiations, and all hell fell on his shoulders, as I think it should fall on the shoulders of the President.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The only difference between the cases is that the boys who are now in totalitarian prisons are Americans drafted under an act of the Congress of the United States. That is the difference. We know who they are: we

8190

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 24

CASTRO, CUBA, TRACTORS, AND  
BLACKMAIL

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I read an article written by Robert C. Ruark, published in Miami, Fla., May 24:

Of all the immoral aspects of our fearful muddling in the Cuban chamber of horrors, it seems to me the so-called humanitarian response to Castro's obscene proposition to trade human flesh for tractors is the most frightening index yet to what's wrong with America at the moment.

This independent effort of Bill Pawley and Mrs. Roosevelt and Milton Eisenhower and Walter Reuther and Cardinal Spellman to raise money to cooperate with Castro in his inhumanely outrageous blackmail scheme does nothing to mark us noble. It merely puts us on Castro's level and compounds the felony.

If the State Department does not flatly forbid the consummation of this deal, it might as well knock off the sanctions against Cuba and admit that the bearded buffoon is no longer a buffoon at all, but a shrewd and powerful man who has defeated America almost without firing a shot.

This how to blackmail is meddling in Government policy, pure and simple. It should not be legal for private citizens to deal with a hostile Government which should be overthrown—unless it overthrows us. Charity and humanitarianism is one thing—weakness and stupidity and meddlesome nullification of your country's policy is another, and I don't care what names are mixed up in it. It is as morally wrong to accede to criminal proposition as it is to make the proposition.

There are some instances in which morality takes precedence over softheaded individual interference with governmental policy. In any war a civilian who did busi-

May 24

ican lives would become a negotiable commodity in the cold war, with Communist tyrants rating them in terms of so many electric razors per man. I say this is nothing for any group of Americans to rush into blindly—without carefully considering where it might lead.

#### WORD FROM CUBA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a page from the Culver Alumnus, touching on the experience of one of the alumni of that school.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WORD FROM CUBA

Until recently, Culver has attracted a fairly large number of students from Cuba in both the winter and summer schools. The knowledge and understanding that has grown for more than a half-century between cadets of the two countries has been instrumental in the fine relationships between the United States and Cuba. It also has brought to most Culver men a particular affection toward Cuba and Cuban citizens.

We are all aware of the horrible tragedy that has befallen our Cuban alumni and patrons in having their country seized by the Communists. Many of them are giving their lives in fighting Communist tyranny. In so doing, they are fighting not only for their own country but the United States and all freemen everywhere.

I have received many letters recently from Cuban alumni and patrons. One of the most poignant is from Jorge Silva, a 1926 graduate of the summer schools and the father of two winter school alumni. It is the most eloquent and passionate statement I have seen from a tortured man fighting for freedom. I reprint excerpts from his April 26 letter because I think it is important to all Culver men to know Mr. Silva's thoughts in this emotion-laden period for him.

"This letter is to inform you and the academy that my two sons Jorge (1959) and Mario (1961) together with other Culver men were in the U.S. endorsed invasion attempt on Cuba during the past week. Jorge is a captive, and Mario is missing.

"It is my firm belief, and this is what I want you to know and the world to know, that all of us who once believed in the greatness of the United States of America feel that they and all of us have been the victims of gross high official treason.

"The only reason why I allowed them to go was that they had an ideal and I could not stop them and that we were told they would be backed to the end by the U.S. Government and its Armed Forces if necessary. We believed this because we know that this fight is not for Cuba or the Cubans. It is a fight for the very life of all Americans.

"I am sure that by the time you read this, in private or to the corps of cadets, they will have been executed."

I firmly believe that the United States is in its most critical period in history. I also believe we are losing the fight to communism by our unwillingness as a people to face up to the situation. The times call for cool thinking, moral courage, a better understanding of the implications of communism, the willingness on the part of each of us to sacrifice, and dynamic action to save our country and Western civilization from succumbing to communism by default.

We at Culver are doing everything in our power—which admittedly is small to face up

and the threat communism poses to it. We recently had a 2-day convocation on communism participated in by three nationally known authorities on the subject and led by Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, president of the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade. We are teaching in history courses and America's democratic heritage course the principles of freedom and the necessity for preserving them. But this is not enough. Americans everywhere must face up to the situation.

I pray to God that Mario and Jorge Silva and all other Cuban sons of Culver will live through this calamity and soon will rejoin us as freemen.

DELMAR T. SPIVEY,  
Superintendent.

#### *(Signature)* CASTRO, BULLDOZERS, AND PRISONERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the morning newspaper tells us that a committee has been set up to collect the means for paying Communist Dictator Fidel Castro the blackmail in bulldozers which he is demanding as the price of 1,214 lives. I have no objection to having the citizens of this country do whatever they want to do about the arrogant, insulting demand made by Castro in an attempt to rub our noses in the fiasco of an American-directed invasion failure—so long as it is done voluntarily, and without government sanction. However, I do resent the attempt on the part of the leaders of this bulldozer committee to convince the American people that yielding to Communist demands is "the way to smash communism." This is precisely what has been wrong with our attitude. We have yielded and yielded and yielded. We have yielded so much that there is not much more to give—at least, not in terms of freedom's real estate throughout the world.

There is one important point to remember about paying "blackmail," and that is that it never ends, once it starts, because the blackmailer is never satisfied. Castro is a good example. Even now he is threatening to change the terms of his offer. He does not like the word "exchange," and insists that any transaction be regarded in the light of "indemnification" for war damages. He does not want the Cubans-in-exile to have any part in the deal. He wants only a certain type of bulldozer. This is only the beginning of his fresh demands.

Undoubtedly there will be more, now that he knows there is a tendency in this country to give in. We shall be lucky if he does not wind up demanding 500 hydrogen bombs, instead of bulldozers.

Mr. President, I suggest that there is something entirely degrading in the picture of the United States of America reduced to the point where she must trade material goods for human lives. If that were carried to its logical extreme, we could reach the point where even Amer-

Approved For Release 2004/03/31 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200140038-8  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 24

the President of the United States that such a contribution is tax deductible; second, to deny that it is not a violation of the Logan Act; third, to maintain that the President is acting as a private individual in appointing the committee and asking it to serve as private individuals and not in behalf of the President of the United States.

I want some Senator to defend that action. I think it is an unpardonable sin. I think this is a regrettable situation and that the Nation will live to regret the action which is being taken at the moment.

I want Senators to tell us that southern Florida will not be wrecked as a result of these actions. I want someone to defend the actions of the President of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one comment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For one comment? Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assure the distinguished Senator from Indiana that Florida has no ghost towns and is not likely to have any. The Bureau of the Census advised the Senators from Florida officially on Saturday that Florida's population has just passed the 5 million mark.

As usual, the Senator from Indiana, in his excitement, has let his extravagance overshadow the facts. Miami has between 30,000 and 40,000 Cuban refugees, which is as close to a quarter of a million as we can get.

So far as we in Florida are concerned—and that is the point to which I shall address myself—if the Senator from Indiana is as badly off on all the other facts which he has recited as he is on his facts relating to Florida, he is in a hopeless situation and had better make a fresh start.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator from Florida deny that the Cuban exiles are taking the jobs of the citizens of Florida at much lower wages than they are entitled to receive?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the interest of expediting the business at hand, I hope the favor done me by the Senator from Iowa will be rewarded by his being recognized, because he was on his feet before I was.

Mr. President, in response to what the Senator from Indiana said, permit me to state that the President needs no defense from anyone for his actions; but if anything needs to be said, it will be said in due time.

#### SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I hesitate at this late hour to take up the time of the Senate.

During the debate on the pending bill almost every feature in connection with Federal aid to education has been discussed, except one.

sufficiently important to warrant the offering of an amendment in connection with it. So I offer my amendment which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend title I by adding the following section:

There is authorized to be appropriated for administering the provisions of this Act during the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, notwithstanding excess of \$1,000,000 for any such year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discussed this question with the Senator from Iowa and also with the Senator from Oregon. I believe they will agree to the allowance of 5 minutes to each side, and then to have the vote taken, with the yeas and nays, as ordered.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that on this amendment, 5 minutes be allowed to each side—or a total of 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the reason for offering the amendment is that there is always much concern among the people of the country about the administrative costs of these measures. I do not need to remind the Senate that today we hear many stories to the effect that for every dollar of tax money that goes into Washington, about 50 cents comes back.

Some assurance was given with respect to this measure, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, during the hearings. As appears on page 157, he said:

I have tried to estimate what the cost of this program would be administratively, and it is our best estimate \* \* \* that it will be about one-tenth of 1 percent.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] added to that assurance, last evening, when he said, as shown at page 8106 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

It is the most economical way of collecting taxes so far as administrative costs are concerned for school purposes that we could have provided. That is borne out further by the testimony of Secretary Ribicoff, which is found at page 157 of the hearings, when the question was raised as to what the administrative cost of the bill would be.

The Secretary said: "So when you consider a program such as this where the administrative cost would be some one-tenth of 1 percent, I do not believe that that is an excessive administrative cost."

Neither do I, Mr. President.

Mr. President, one-tenth of 1 percent of the \$850 million a year would be \$850,000. My amendment provides for a little leeway; it provides for a top limit of 1 percent.

going to hold down the administrative costs, we should do so in the case of an aid to education bill.

I cannot support the pending bill; but if it becomes law, the very least which I believe should be done is to assure to the children who will be benefited by means of the bill that the least amount of administrative cost will be incurred in connection with its administration. That is the reason for this amendment.

I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Oregon will accept the amendment, which is in line with the assurance he gave the Senate last evening. In fact, the amendment goes beyond that assurance, because the amendment provides for up to \$1 million of authorization for the administration of this measure.

At this time I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject the amendment; and in this connection I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is not only a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but also is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

This amendment seeks—without any assurance at all in regard to the necessary administrative expenditures in connection with the act—to say to the Appropriations Committee, "You cannot pay any attention to the evidence you receive; in any event, you are limited to \$1 million."

Certainly under the practices of the Senate the checks on the administrators are to be applied by the Appropriations Committee, after giving full consideration to the subject, rather than applied by the Senate as a whole. Otherwise, we will have the Senate as a whole invade the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

In connection with the amendment, let us consider the record.

As first introduced, it was believed that the total administrative expenditures of the measure for the so-called first year—which actually would be only a part of the fiscal year—would be \$683,000; in 1963, \$1,022,000; and in the third year—the last year of full operations under the act, unless it is extended—\$1,077,000; and for 1965, when the operations in connection with the act would be cleaned up, after the act went out of existence, \$594,000; and in 1966, \$64,000.

This is no longer a \$666 million authorization. It is an \$850 million authorization.

On the basis of the \$666 million authorization, the figures which were presented were that in two of the years the administrative costs would be a little more than \$1 million—in 1 year, \$1,077,000; and in the other year, \$1,022,000. Those are not excessively high costs.

It is true that in the course of the testimony, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated, in answer to a question and not in the course of a prepared statement,

8186

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

*May 24*

Urgent  
CASTRO, CUBANS, AND TRACTORS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last night in a colloquy with the Senator from Colorado some question arose about editorials in New York newspapers concerning what is variously called Operation Tractors or Operation Rescue, with respect to the Cuban patriots held by Castro.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the editorials to which I referred last night, as well as other editorials which have since come to hand on this subject. Also I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement made today on the same subject by the President of the United States.